

Application No. 09/905,502

Page 9 of 10

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-44 are pending in the present application.

Claims 1-3, 7-14, 18-25, 29-36 and 40-44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,748,439 (Montichello et al.) in view of a July 2000 CISCO white paper. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as follows. Independent claims 1, 12, 23 and 34, as amended above, recite the limitation whereby the platform is configured to support performance enhancing functions including protocol spoofing. Further, these claims recite that the received backbone connection parameters are associated with a backbone connection to a peer platform, wherein the backbone connection parameters include information relating to traffic compression over the backbone connection and information relating to the protocol spoofing. Applicants submit, however, that the cited combination of Montichello and CISCO fail to teach or suggest these new limitations recited in the independent claims as amended. The cited combination of Montichello and CISCO, therefore, fails to render the rejected claims obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claims 4-6, 15-17, 26-28 and 37-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Montichello in view of CISCO (as applied in the above-referenced rejection), and further in view of USPN 6,856,676 (Pirof). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection based on the claim amendments made to the respective base independent claims (as presented above), and submit that the cited combination including the Pirof reference also fails to teach or suggest the newly added limitations. The cited combination of Montichello, CISCO and Pirof, therefore, fails to render the rejected claims obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Applicants, therefore, respectfully submit that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and notice to this effect is respectfully requested.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein; and no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

Post Available Cor

Application No. 09/905,502  
Page 10 of 10

If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring adverse action in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Mr. Craig Plastrik, at 301-601-7252, so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully Submitted,



Craig Plastrik  
Reg. No. 41,254

Dated: 9 June 2005

HUGHES NETWORK SYSTEMS, LLC  
Customer No. 29190

BEST AVAILABLE COPY